

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

MICHAEL PATRICK YOUNG,

Plaintiff,

v.

CLARK COUNTY MUNICIPAL JUSTICE
COURTS; STEIN FORENSIC HOSPITAL,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:25-cv-00352-RFB-EJY

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This action commenced on February 24, 2025 when Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, filed an Initiating Document. *See* ECF No. 1-1. Plaintiff did not file a Complaint or an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (sometimes “IFP”). Plaintiff also did not pay the filing fee necessary to commence a civil action. The Court issued an Order on April 8, 2025, giving Plaintiff through and including May 6, 2025 to file a complaint on the Court’s form together with the filing fee or a complete IFP application by a non prisoner. ECF No. 10. The Court explained that failure to comply with the Order would result in a recommendation to dismiss this action without prejudice. *Id.*

On April 21, 2025, Plaintiff responded to the Court’s Order stating he “need not file an in forma pauperis.” ECF No. 13. Plaintiff further states that “any fines ... [are] to be levied against the defendant.” As of the date of this Recommendation, Plaintiff has not filed a complaint, paid the filing fee, or submitted an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. In their absence, and given the Court’s prior Order, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this matter be dismissed without prejudice.

Dated this 14th day of May, 2025.


ELAYNA J. YOUCHAK
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

NOTICE

Under Local Rule IB 3-2, any objection to this Report and Recommendation must be in writing and filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen (14) days. The Supreme Court holds the courts of appeal may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the specified time. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985). The Ninth Circuit also held that (1) failure to file objections within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and brief the objectionable issues waives the right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal factual issues from the order of the District Court. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991); *Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).